DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 160 JC 850 006

AUTHOR Piland, William E.
TITLE Remedial Education in the States.
INSTITUTION Illinois State Univ., Normal. Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction.
SPONS AGENCY National Council of State Directors of Community-Junior Colleges.
PUB DATE Dec 83
NOTE 68p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; College Role; *Community Colleges; Courses; National Surveys; Questionnaires; *Remedial Instruction; Remedial Programs; State Agencies; *State Aid; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to ascertain the status of remedial education in the United States as perceived by state directors of community colleges. The study sought information on how the states defined remedial education; the states' mission in regard to remedial education; the courses funded as remedial; the governmental agencies with authority in this area; the methods of funding; the educational levels at which remedial education is conducted; and the present condition of remedial education in each state. A questionnaire was sent to state directors of community colleges in the 50 states and Puerto Rico. Based on responses from 40 states, study findings revealed: (1) 62% of the states did not have an official or working definition of remedial education; (2) 49% of the states had a remedial education mission statement in their community college enabling legislation; (3) secondary level math, English and reading courses tended to be funded as remedial in community colleges; (4) in 49% of the states, the body with responsibility for administering/coordinating remedial education in the community colleges was the state higher education board/agency; (5) 86% of the community college remedial courses received state funding; and (6) 84% of the respondents identified the community colleges as the primary providers of remedial education. The study includes a discussion of implications and recommendations; and the survey instrument. (HB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED251160

# REMEDIAL EDUCATION IN THE STATES

A study sponsored by

The National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges

December, 1983

JC 850 006

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wm. Witter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# REMEDIAL EDUCATION IN THE STATES

A study sponsored by

The National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges

Conducted by

Dr. William E. Piland
Project Director and Principal Investigator

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
Normal, Illinois

December, 1983

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the status of remedial education in the states as perceived by state directors (or delegated staff) of community/junior colleges. This study attempted to gather information regarding: the states' definition of remedial education, the states' mission in regard to remedial education, the courses which are funded as remedial, the identification of the state governmental agencies which coordinate remedial education, the methods by which remedial education is funded, the educational levels where remedial education is conducted, and the present condition of remedial education in the states.

In formulating the purpose for the study, consideration was given to the concepts of "remedial" and "developmental" education. At times, the terms appear to be used interchangeably, while distinctions are drawn between the terms at other times. "Remedial" has come to mean corrective or curative education which attempts to help students learn something which was not previously learned or which had been forgotten (Clowes, 1980).

Developmental education places emphasis on the development of the whole person in a positive manner (Roueche, 1977). K. Pat Cross suggests that if the purpose of a program is to overcome academic deficiencies the program is remedial in the standard dictionary sense. If the purpose of a program is to develop the diverse talents of students whether academic or not, the program is developmental because it develops strengths as well as corrects weaknesses (Cross, 1976). Since the term "developmental" suggests areas beyond academic subject matter, it was considered too imprecise a term to use in this study. Therefore, while the study focuses on "remedial education," some study respondents submitted information containing other terminology. For instance,

South Carolina material uses the term "developmental" exclusively. Washington material contained only the term "basic skills," while material from Maryland used the term "remedial/ developmental."

The study population included all fifty states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

## Significance of the Study

Remedial education is not a new phenomenon in education, at any level. American higher education has had over 100 years' experience with remedial education. In fact, some preparatory departments date back to before the Civil War (Maxwell, 1979), while K. Pat Cross has identified the first remedial course offered as a part of the "regular" college program at Wellesley in 1894 (Cross, 1976). Yet the problem of underprepared students entering post-secondary education continues to plague educators, policy makers, and the public. It is not, nor has it ever been, a temporary problem which will someday disappear. It is, instead, a problem of enormous magnitude and complexity in need of long-range solutions rather than short-term holding actions (Promises to Keep, 1983).

There are, of course, many symptoms of the remedial education problem. For example, the "average student entering community college reads somewhere between the eighth and ninth grade level--if he finished high school" (Roueche, 1978). Also, it is generally accepted that "up to 35% of the adult population is not educationally functional or employable in the current transforming society" (Platform for Excellence, 1983). Between 1968 and 1980, mean SAT scores of college-bound seniors nationally fell over 40 points on the verbal test and 26 points in mathematics. The litany provided here is an abbreviated one. The problem's symptoms appear limitless.

While the problem of underprepared students and the response of remedial education have been with us for a long time, the literature is limited with respect to successful procedures in remediation (Cosand, 1979; Roueche and Snow, 1978). In many areas of the country remedial education has only recently been identified as a major community college mission, particularly by state agencies and boards. Emphases in the past seem to be placed on transfer and vocational programs (Cosand, 1979). For example, in September, 1979, the Illinois General Assembly passed legislation which specified that "By March 1, 1980, the Boards (Higher Education and Community College) shall develop guidelines which: (1) place the emphasis on post-secondary remedial programs at public community colleges and (2) reduce the role of the state universities in offering remedial programs" (PL 81-803, 1979). Also, a recent remedial education study in Maryland indicated that "while the important role of community colleges in remedial education has come to be accepted, it is important to realize that this has not always been the case. Serious questions about the state's stress on and support for remedial education were raised in 1972 and 1973" (Study of Remedial/Developmental Education in Maryland, 1982). A report from South Carolina stated that the earliest mention of developmental studies in the minutes of the State Committee occurred in 1970 when an allocation of $21,500 was made to a technical college to establish a developmental studies program (Developmental Studies in the TEC System, 1983). These few cases are illustrative of the problem as identified by Cosand.

Remedial courses have been growing at an extremely fast rate. Remedial education is the fastest growing area of the curriculum. Nationally, enrollments in these courses increased by twenty-two percent in 1979 and 1980 compared to a fifteen percent increase for all courses during the same time period

(Magarrell, 1981). Presently, an estimated two thirds of post-secondary institutions in the country provide remedial writing and reading courses. Remediation is a pervasive issue (Promises to Keep, 1983). And "this endeavor may well be the major challenge facing the community colleges in the 1980s" (Cosand, 1979).

## METHOD

### Sample

The initial population for this study consisted of the State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges in the fifty states plus Puerto Rico. This population represents the membership of the National Council of State Directors of the American Association of Community/Junior Colleges (AACJC). The population was drawn from the 1983 AACJC Directory.

Usable responses were reviewed from 40 states (78%) in the sample. An additional two responses were received after the data were calculated and, therefore, were not included in the analysis. The instruments were typically completed by the state director or a staff member involved with the financial aspect of the state system of community/junior colleges.

### Instrument

A three-page mail-out opinion questionnaire was used to solicit information pertinent to the seven key research questions which guided the study. The key questions were:

1. How do the various states define remedial education?
2. Do the states have mission statements for remedial education?
3. What courses are funded as remedial?
4. What governmental agencies at the state level have authority for coordinating/administering the remedial education mission?
5. How is remedial education funded in the states?
6. At what educational level(s) is remedial education conducted?
7. What is the present status/condition of remedial education in the states?

The instrument contained 25 questions (Appendix). There were 13 checklists six dichotomous, four fill-in blanks, and four open-ended-type items used in the questionnaire (two of these were explanations of two dichotomous items). Some items sought the opinions of state directors while others called for factual financial data.

The items were categorized into six groupings. The categories and number of items within each category were: Definitions (3 items), Mission Statement (2 items), Providers (3 items), Administration/Coordination (2 items), Funding (11 items), and Present Status (4 items).

The key questions and survey instrument were developed by the researcher. These project elements were then reviewed by members of the State Directors Council, Research and Data Committee. Two drafts of the questionnaire were developed with Committee input before the instrument was finalized. The key questions were only slightly reworded based on the Committee's review.

Data Collection

The instruments were mailed to the sample on August 28, 1983, along with a cover letter explaining the study purpose, approach, and potential uses of the results. The instruments were precoded and accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return. The cover letter also requested written information or documents which were to be sent by a separate mailing (Appendix). A follow-up mailing to non-respondents was sent on September 14, 1983. A majority of responses were received within 15 days of the first mailing, with the last responses arriving within three weeks from the time of the second mailing.

Design

Since this study was basically a descriptive survey, the primary analysis techniques included descriptive statistics such as percentages, frequencies, means, and ranges. Total and average dollar figures were also determined for items dealing with financing remedial education.

RESULTS

The survey results were organized around the seven key research questions. These results are presented on the following pages. Each page contains an Evidence Column, with the survey instrument item identified by number, and a Conclusions Column listing observations gleaned from the survey results.

Key Question 1: How do the various states define remedial education?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence* | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 1. Does your state have an official or working definition of remedial education?<br><br>Yes: 38%<br>No: 62%<br>Not Sure: - | I. Most states do not have an official or working definition of remedial education.<br><br>Those states without a definition are not sure if they need one. |
| 2. If no, should there be one?<br><br>Yes: 26%<br>No: 26%<br>Not Sure: 48% | |
| 3. Check the following educational functions if they are considered part of your definition of remedial education.<br><br>100% High School Level Academic Courses (e.g., Math, English, Reading)<br><br>71% English as a Second Language<br><br>64% Personal Improvement Courses (e.g., Study Skills, Personal Development, Career Awareness)<br><br>57% Adult Basic Education<br><br>50% General Education Development (Secondary Education) | II. The educational functions included within most definitions of remedial education include high school level academic courses, English as a second language (ESL), personal improvement courses, Adult Basic Education (ABE), and General Education Development (GED).<br><br>A few states include pre-employment vocational oriented courses and tutoring programs within their definition of remedial education. |

*Evidence numbers correspond to Questionnaire item numbers in Appendix.

Key Question 1 (cont'd): How do the various states define remedial education?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| Review of documents, reports, and operating rules and regulations. | III. The most common definition of remedial education is "an instructional program or activity designed to provide basic skills education which prepares students for the successful pursuit of post-secondary education."<br><br>Some definitions include specific courses (e.g., communications, reading, mathematics) while others make reference to basic skills from elementary and secondary education as well as English as a Second Language.<br><br>A number of definitions also qualify the term "remediation" by stating that it is a re-doing or reiterating of basic skills which should have been mastered prior to entry into the post-secondary system. |

Key Question 2: Do the states have mission statements for remedial education?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 4. Is there a remedial education mission statement in your state's community/junior college enabling law, state policy, state education regulations, and/or state guidelines?<br><br>Yes 49%  No 51% | Slightly fewer than one-half of the states have a remedial education mission statement in their community college enabling legislation or state policies.<br><br>In most cases the mission statement has not been changed within the last three years in those states with such a statement.<br><br>Where changes in mission statements have occurred, they tend to focus on a clarification of role for the community/junior college system and for increased articulation with the elementary/secondary school system to reduce the need for remediation. |
| 5a. If yes, has the mission statement changed within the past three (3) years?<br><br>Yes 17%  No 83% | |
| 5b. If yes, please explain the change.<br><br>1) Clarified the role of colleges.<br><br>2) Work closely with local school districts and State Board of Education toward reducing the need for remedial education. | |

Key Question 3: What courses are funded as remedial?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | | | | | Conclusions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20. How are the following generic course areas in community/ junior colleges funded by your state? | | | | | I. Secondary school level math, English and reading courses tend to be funded as remedial courses in community/junior colleges in the states. |
| N | Remedial | Other | Not Funded | | II. Secondary school level social and general sciences, basic business understanding and consumer education courses are either funded under some category other than remedial or not funded by the states. |
| (22) | 73% | 18% | 9% | Math, High School (Secondary) Level | III. Personal development and career awareness courses tend to be funded in a category other than remedial. |
| (21) | 71% | 19% | 10% | English, High School (Secondary) Level | IV. Study skills and English as a Second Language (ESL) courses are either funded under remedial or some other category in a number of states. |
| (21) | 71% | 19% | 10% | Reading, High School (Secondary) Level | V. Funding for General Education Development (GED) and Adult Basic Education (ABE) courses varies greatly from remedial to other to no funding at all, within the country. |
| (18) | 39% | 44% | 17% | Study Skills | |
| (19) | 37% | 47% | 16% | English as a Second Language | |
| (19) | 32% | 36% | 32% | General Education Development (GED) | |
| (19) | 26% | 42% | 32% | Adult Basic Education (ABE) | |
| (18) | 22% | 56% | 22% | Personal Development | |
| (17) | 18% | 71% | 11% | Career Awareness | |
| (18) | 17% | 50% | 33% | Basic Business Understanding | |
| (20) | 10% | 50% | 40% | Social Studies, High School (Secondary) Level | |
| (18) | 11% | 50% | 39% | General Science, High School (Secondary) Level | |
| (16) | 6% | 69% | 25% | Consumer Education | |

Key Question 4: What governmental agencies at the state level have authority for coordinating/administering the remedial education mission?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 9. Check the governmental agencies at the state level which have authority for administering/coordinating the remedial education mission in community/junior colleges.<br><br>49% Higher Education Board/Agency<br>35% Community/Junior College Board/Agency<br>30% Other<br>11% Elementary-Secondary Board/Agency<br>8% Vocational/Technical Board/Agency<br>- Governor's Office<br>133%* Total<br><br>*Total higher than 100% of respondents due to the fact that some states have 2 or more boards/agencies sharing responsibilities.<br><br>10. If the authority is shared between agencies, what are the primary responsibilities of each agency in remedial education?<br><br>13 (35%) of the states reported shared authority among agencies for remedial/developmental education. | I. There are a variety of governmental boards/agencies across the country which have the authority for administering/coordinating the remedial education mission in community/junior colleges.<br><br>Higher education and community/junior college boards or agencies have the administration/coordination function in most states.<br><br>II. Shared authority between state agencies usually involves (1) a community college and higher education board or agency; (2) a state community college board/agency and local community college boards; and (3) a community college and an elementary/secondary board/agency.<br><br>Primary responsibilities shared by boards or agencies involve (1) policy and program approval; (2) service to students based on age (minors or adults); and (3) funding based upon institutional type (secondary or post-secondary). |

Key Question 5: How is remedial education funded in the states?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|

11. Do community/junior college remedial courses receive state funding?

| Yes | No |
|---|---|
| 86% | 14% |

12. If yes, how does your state determine funding?

| | |
|---|---|
| 38% | On credit generated and/or FTEs |
| 25% | At same rate as all college-level courses |
| 25% | By incremental or annually varying formula |
| 6% | On maximum ACT score |
| 6% | Other |
| | 1 State--Line item in state appropriations |
| | 1 State--Funded with elementary/secondary education |

13. On what basis is the state funding for community/junior college remedial education determined? (Check appropriate response(s)).

| | |
|---|---|
| 53% | Other (See next page) |
| 22% | Per credit hour |
| 16% | Per student |
| 13% | Per contact hour |
| 3% | Per course |
| 107* | |

21. Does your state have a requirement that students pay full share for remedial education?

| | |
|---|---|
| 94% | No |
| 3% | Not sure |
| 3% | Local policy |
| - | Yes |

* Total higher than number of respondents due to fact that more than one response could be checked.

1. The overwhelming majority of states provides funding for remedial courses.

   There is no consistent pattern for determining or actually funding remedial education across the states.

   No state reported requiring remedial education students to pay the full cost of that type of education.

Key Question 5 (cont'd): How is remedial education funded in the states?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 13. (cont'd)<br>Other<br><br>19% Per FTEs<br>19% Combination of ways (e.g., per student credit hour and previous year funding)<br>13% Part of total budget<br>3% Per ACT score<br><br>14. What rate of state funding currently exists for remedial education in community/junior colleges?<br><br>58% Cannot determine, not available<br><br>19% Allocated per FTEs<br>Low \$810 — High \$3559 — Mean \$1866 — Median \$1606<br><br>10% Allocated per credit hour<br>Low \$17.24 — High \$60.17 — Mean \$38.40<br><br>6% Total allocated to remedial in community/junior college<br>Low \$443,719 — High \$443,883 — Mean \$443,801<br><br>3% Allocated per student<br>\$ 200.00<br><br>3% Allocated per ADA (average daily attendance)<br>\$1,540.00 | 11. Most states could not determine or did not have data available to report the rate of state funding for remedial education.<br><br>Where data exist, rates of funding vary considerably among the states regardless of the type of funding system in use. |

Key Question 5 (cont'd): How is remedial education funded in the states?

SURVEY RESULTS

Evidence

13. What is the average funding rate for all community/junior college education supported by the state?

| | † Per credit hr. | | | | † Per FTE | | | | † Per student | | | | † Per ADA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *% | H | L | M | % | H | L | M *** | % | H | L | M | % | H | L | M |
| State Average | 12% | 60.17 | 17.24 | 37.75 | 35% | 3100. | 810. | 1947. | 8% | 2570. | 1705. | 2137. | 4% | | | 1540 |
| Liberal Arts Average | 8% | 60.17 | 21.96 | 41.07 | 19% | 2423. | 810. | 1625. | | | | | | | | |
| Vocational Average | 8% | 60.17 | 24.99 | 42.58 | 19% | 2956. | 878. | 1842. | | | | | | | | |
| Adult Basic Ed. (Secondary) | 4% | | | 4.00 | 4% | | | 1726. | | | | | | | | |
| General Studies | 4% | | | 0.98 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $ Figure not Available | 42% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total** | 167% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

*% = Percent of respondents, H = High; L = Low; M = Mean

**Total greater than 100% due to the fact that respondents could respond in more than one category.

***State average per FTE includes responses from states which did not respond to other categories (e.g., liberal arts, vocational).

†These numbers are dollar amounts.



Conclusions

III. Average funding for remedial education based on credit hour funding ($38.40) is slightly higher than the states' average for all courses ($37.75) but below the average of funding for liberal arts ($41.07) and vocational courses ($42.58).

Average funding for remedial education based on full-time equivalent student (FTE) funding ($1866) is somewhat below the states' average for all courses ($1947) but higher than average for liberal arts ($1625) and vocational education (1842).

Key Question 5 (cont'd): How is remedial education funded in the states?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 16. How much total money was expended by your state for remedial education in community/junior colleges during the 1982 fiscal year?<br><br>High: $66,342,962 — Low: $14,500 — Mean: $7,612,264 — Median: $3,408,181<br><br>55% responded; 45% figures not available | IV. Like funding rates, total amounts of money and the percentage of total state funding spent by states on remedial education vary considerably.<br><br>Most states spent a higher or similar percentage of total state funding for remedial education in the last year compared to the prior year. |
| 17. What percentage of total state funding was expended for remedial education in community/junior colleges in FY 1982?<br><br>High: 10.6% — Low: 1.27% — Mean: 4.93%<br><br>48% responded; 52% figures not available | |
| 18. Is the expenditure percentage indicated for remedial education in FY 82 more or less than it was in FY 81?<br><br>More: 38.5% — Less: 23% — Same: 38.5% | |

Key Question 5 (cont'd): How is remedial education funded in the states?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 19. What do you expect the future trend for state funding for remedial education to become?<br><br>62.5% Remaining constant over next three years<br><br>16% Increasing over next three years<br><br>12.5% Cannot say<br><br>9% Decreasing over next three years | V. Most states expect funding will remain constant for remedial education within the next three years. |

Key Question 6: At what educational level(s) is remedial education conducted?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 6. Check the types of institutions which are primary providers of remedial education.<br><br>84% Community/Junior Colleges<br>49% Secondary Schools<br>49% Adult Education Centers<br>41% Vocational/Technical Schools<br>38% Four-Year Colleges and Universities<br>14% Other<br>275%*<br><br>1 CETA-related agencies<br>2 Elementary schools<br>1 Community-based agencies<br>1 Corrections<br><br>* Total is greater than 100% due to fact respondents could check more than one type of institution. | 1. Many types of institutions are primary providers of remedial education across the states. However, a large majority of states identify community/junior colleges as providers who have the largest number of remedial students. |
| 7. Which type of institution checked in #6 serves the largest number of students in remedial education?<br><br>43% Community/Junior Colleges<br>19% Secondary Schools<br>16% Don't know<br>14% Adult Education Centers<br>8% Vocational/Technical Schools<br>5% Elementary Public Schools | |

Key Question 6 (cont'd): At what educational level(s) is remedial education conducted?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 8a. Have there been within the past 3 years, or are there anticipated, any shifts in the types of institutions where remedial education will be conducted?<br><br>51% No<br><br>32% Yes<br><br>16% Not sure | 11. Most states did not perceive a shift in the types of primary providers of remedial education within the next three years. However, those states anticipating shifts reported movement away from universities toward community/junior colleges. |
| 8b. If yes, please explain.<br><br>58% Shift toward community colleges<br><br>42% Shift away from universities<br><br>17% Remediation before college entry<br><br>8% Shift toward 4-year colleges<br>125%* | |

* Total greater than 100% because some respondents perceived shifts in more than one direction.

Key Question 7: What is the present status/condition of remedial education in the states?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 22. Compared to 5 years ago, how much emphasis is remedial education receiving at the state level today?<br><br>62% More emphasis<br><br>27% No change in emphasis<br><br>8% Less emphasis<br><br>3% Don't know | 1. A majority of states report more emphasis on remedial education at the state level than five years ago and that somewhat or substantially more students are enrolled in remedial courses than there were five years ago. |
| 23. Compared to 5 years ago, what is the current enrollment in remedial education?<br><br>38% Somewhat more students enrolled<br><br>30% Substantially more students enrolled<br><br>19% No change<br><br>11% Somewhat fewer students enrolled<br><br>3% Figures not available<br><br>- Substantially fewer students enrolled | |

Key Question 7 (cont'd): What is the present status/condition of remedial education in the states?

SURVEY RESULTS

| Evidence | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| 24. How important is the remedial education mission compared to other community/junior college missions at the: | 11. Remedial education appears to be of equal importance or somewhat less important than other educational missions at both the state and local levels. |
| State Level / Local Level / | The remedial education mission is perceived as being accomplished at a high or fair degree at both the state and local levels. |
| 43% / 41% / Of equal importance | |
| 38% / 27% / Somewhat less important | |
| 16% / 3% / Substantially less important | |
| 3% / 5% / Somewhat more important | |
| - / 3% / Substantially more important | |
| - / 5% / Varies at each college | |
| - / 16% / Unable to respond | |
| 25. To what degree is the remedial education mission being fulfilled at the: | |
| State Level / Local Level / | |
| 41% / 49% / To a high degree | |
| 35% / 27% / Somewhat | |
| 16% / 3% / To a low degree | |
| 8% / 16% / Unable to respond | |
| - / - / Not at all | |
| - / 5% / Varies at each college | |

IMPLICATIONS

It appears that as long as community/junior colleges exist they will be involved in providing remedial education to academically underprepared students. Many students who drop out of the educational system prior to graduation from secondary schools and students who do graduate without mastering certain basic skills or who lose these skills because of atrophy will probably, at some time in adulthood, continue to seek additional education at a community/junior college. This phenomenon is not foreign to community/junior college practitioners.

The continued immigration of foreign-born and those with limited English speaking and writing skills who aspire to post-secondary education will necessitate the offering of remedial educational experiences in community/junior colleges. In fact, there are several categories of special needs learners who will need remedial education when they enter the community/junior colleges through their open doors.

Remedial education, as evidenced by the opinions of state directors responding to this survey, is of approximately equal importance to other community/junior colleges' missions at both the local and state level. These same respondents report that states are presently placing more emphasis on remedial education and more students are enrolling in remedial education courses as compared to five years ago. Remedial education apparently will grow in importance as a community/junior college function at least into the near future.

The conclusions resulting from the evidence produced by this study suggest recommendations for remedial education which should be considered by community/

junior college state directors and their staffs. These recommendations are organized in the next section of the report by categories associated with the key reserch questions which guided this study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Definition of Remedial Education

**a. Each state should develop an official or working definition of remedial education.**

Many states are funding remedial education courses or learning experiences though they report no definition for this type of education. There also appears to be rather considerable variation between the states concerning what experiences are funded as remedial education. Without a definition, it would appear difficult to determine the types of educational experiences considered remedial in nature.

To be prepared for the near future, with an apparent increase in the importance of the remedial function and an increase in anticipated students in remedial education, an official or working definition of the concept seems needed.

This formal definition can be used to determine the educational experiences which will be funded at a remedial education rate. Funding for remedial education within a state will be consistent within the parameters of the definition. The definition can also provide for a uniform system of counting students receiving remedial education which can lead to a reliable data base used for comparison purposes. Further, the common concepts embodied in the definition will facilitate discussions about remedial education since state staff and local, post-secondary institutional representatives will operate from a common language base.

Once the definition is developed it should be widely distributed within the state. Governmental agencies and departments concerned with post-secondary education, legislators, citizen groups, and community/junior colleges should receive copies of the definition.

b. **The official or working definition of remedial education should be stated in broad terms with specific examples of remedial subjects or courses provided for clarification purposes.**

A number of states already define remedial education in the manner suggested above. A very few states use a highly specific definition while a few more states have a broad definition. The broad definition provides a direction and overall organizer for state and local people when they consider remedial education. The specific examples help clarify and focus the definition providing common reference points when state staff and local educators discuss remedial education.

This recommended form of definition also provides a framework for funding, when the funding system is tied to the definition. If remedial education is funded as a separate category, apart from other funding, there will be a written rationale for including or excluding educational experiences in the remedial education category. The notion of the broad definition with specific examples should prove flexible enough to allow for the inclusion of new or changing educational experiences in remedial education. At the same time, the definition should help to determine limits restricting inappropriate experiences in the remedial funding category.

It should be noted that this recommendation treats remedial education, in the manner suggested for definition purposes, as a unique program or combination of courses. Such an approach suggests that remedial education is a function of subject matter content and <u>not</u> of student educational objectives. Therefore, remedial education is identified as portions of bodies of knowledge needed (required or

recommended) for students to have a better chance of success in a post-secondary institution. This approach to establishing a definition of remedial education appears practical, especially for funding purposes. It, however, may be an artificial approach to defining what remedial education should be in a post-secondary institution. The type of program for which a student registers (which purportedly reflects a student's educational goals) may require "remedial experiences" unique to that program. For example, if a student registers in a community/junior college transfer program, his or her remediation needs may be different from that of a student enrolling in a vocational program or a general education program. Even within vocational programs, varying types of remediation experiences may be required for entry into different programs, especially between the degree and certificate levels.

The approach to establishing a definition recommended here appears practical and one which might bring clarity to the realm of remedial education. There are, of course, other approaches which could emanate from varying concepts of remedial education.

c. **Once defined, the concept of remedial education should be discussed by state and local community/junior college staffs in relation to the concept of developmental education.**

While this study was concerned with remedial education in the states, some respondents to the questionnaire wrote or mailed information dealing with "developmental education." Usually, distinctions were made between the two concepts. In a few states, the terms seemed to be used interchangeably. There appears to be some confusion about the terms when state definitions and policies are viewed in total.

The current literature regarding remedial and developmental education has done little to clarify the concepts. However, some writers (Cross, Roueche, and Friedlander) have suggested that "remedial education" is an evolutionary term giving way to "developmental education." Developmental education is considered a broader concept encompassing more than the cognitive skill areas of reading, writing, and computation normally associated with remedial education. Writers who prefer the term "developmental" suggest that it includes experiences typically associated with the affective learning domain. Developmental education, therefore, includes educational experiences in personal development, career awareness, human potential, study skills, and values clarification, to mention a few areas. Some of the experiences from this list are currently funded as remedial education in some states.

Much of the current research reported by Cross and Roueche suggests that, for many students, remedial education focusing on basic

cognitive skill development is inadequate to help these students succeed in college. Rather, attention must also be focused on affective areas if a change in behavior is a desired result. To attempt to "re-do" basic skills which were not mastered in the first place would appear to be an investment in failure, if some affective changes were not made at the same time.

A state task force or, perhaps, an advisory committee to the state agency coordinating community/junior colleges, with representatives from the local levels, could develop positions regarding the relationship of remedial education to developmental education. Or, perhaps, distinctions between the two concepts could be identified. The implications of funding for remedial education could also be considered in light of relationships to or distinctions from developmental education. New funding patterns may emerge from such deliberations.

**d. States which have an official or working definition of remedial education should review that definition on a regular basis.**

On a regular basis (perhaps every three years) states should review their definition of remedial education to ascertain its effectiveness in reflecting state policy and in meeting local needs. Through discussions with state staff, advisory groups, and local community/junior college education leaders, the timeliness and effectiveness of the definition can be determined. Student population characteristics, secondary school graduation requirements, university entrance requirements, scores on national exams, results of minimal competency tests, and community needs assessments are sources of information which ought to be considered when the state's definition of remedial education is under review.

The state should change its official or working definition of remedial education if warranted by the results of the review. A change should reflect current practices and anticipated needs.

2. Mission Statement for Remedial Education

**a. Each state should develop a mission statement describing the role of the community/junior college in remedial education and attempt to have the statement enacted into law or to become part of official state policy.**

The development of a mission statement is frequently a serious, laborious undertaking involving numerous constituent groups. Developing a state-level mission statement would require collaborative efforts on a broad scale. Often the initiative for such an undertaking comes from the legislature or executive branch. Regardless of whatever group initiates the process, the state agency charged with coordinating community/junior colleges should seek input for a mission statement from a large number of constituencies. Existing or newly formed advisory committees, student groups, local leaders from all educational levels, state staff, legislators and citizen groups could participate in discussions about the remedial education mission for community/junior colleges.

A mission statement should focus on the role of community/junior colleges in remedial education vis-a-vis secondary schools and four-year colleges and universities. The mission ought to be clearly delineated and ought to capitalize on the inherent strengths of community/junior colleges. Mission statements from other states could serve as a beginning talking point.

Once a mission statement is developed it should be widely distributed throughout the state. All agencies and groups concerned with remedial education should receive copies of it.

b. **States which operate with a mission statement for remedial education should review that statement on a regular basis.**

See Recommendation 1-d regarding the definition of "remedial education." The approach suggested for that recommendation is applicable to this one.

3. Governmental Agencies and Remedial Education

**Each state should have (1) one agency/board responsible for coordinating/administering remedial education in the post-secondary educational system, or (2) where more than one responsible agency/board exists, a mechanism for coordination, functioning effectively, needs to exist.**

Some states reported having two or more agencies responsible for coordinating or administering remedial education in community/junior colleges. Other states reported that authority is shared between two or more state agencies. In these situations, duplications, inefficiencies, and confusion could develop which might hamper the effective delivery of remedial education to students in need of these educational experiences.

A case could be made for the state agency or board most directly involved with community/junior colleges to probably be the one that maintains full authority and responsibility for the remedial education mission in post-secondary education. (In response to a question dealing with the levels where remedial education is conducted, 58% reported a shift toward community colleges, while 42% reported a shift away from universities. Only 8% of the respondents reported a shift toward universities.) In such an arrangement, clear lines of authority ought to be established which eliminate gaps and overlapping that might otherwise exist. Also, one responsible agency would help facilitate the planning and delivery of remedial education to post-secondary students.

Furthermore, any conflict in the allocation of funds to local institutions should be reduced. Paperwork and coordination problems at the local level could also be reduced when only one state agency has the total responsibility for post-secondary remedial education. Duplication for

reporting and funding purposes can cause undue expense and inefficiencies at a local post-secondary education agency. The reporting and funding responsibilities for local institutions regarding remedial education should not become cumbersome, as it is with vocational education in some states where two or more agencies are involved with coordinating or administering vocational education.

In a number of states, however, the coordinating/administering functions for remedial education are shared between agencies. A coordinating mechanism, such as an inter-educational agency coordinating committee or a formal communications procedure, could be established which reduces or eliminates problems of duplication or inconsistency regarding, at least, the reporting requirements of local, post-secondary institutions. The underlying purpose of coordinating efforts should be "how can remedial education be effectively and efficiently provided students in a variety of post-secondary institutions" within the requirements of the coordinating agencies/boards. (Recommendation 5b. dealing with the levels at which remedial education is conducted also addresses coordination concerns.)

4. Funding of Remedial Education

a. **States which fund remedial education at the post-secondary level should review their funding systems.**

Each state ought to review current funding policies in terms of present and anticipated needs in the near future. With projected growth in enrollments in post-secondary remedial education and increased emphasis on the remedial function in many states, funding might need to be restructured or, at least, reconsidered. Additionally, this review of the funding system should be based on a comparison of the system to the state's mission statement for remedial education. A key question to be asked is "Is the funding system adequate to meet the mission of post-secondary education in remedial education?" Funding goals need to be identified which will assist community/junior colleges in fulfilling their remedial education mission. In addition, the funding of remedial education experiences should be reviewed in relation to the funding for other types or functions of education. Since most states reported that the remedial education mission is equal in importance to other community/junior college missions, funding ought to be at least equal also.

Just as it has been recommended that states regularly review their definition and mission statement for remedial education, so too should funding systems be regularly reviewed. Changing needs should be identified and, if possible, anticipated so that funding systems can be altered to meet new or revised needs.

State priorities for education at the post-secondary level can be established via funding. The funding system, in effect, could set the priority. For example, if economic development is a priority concern for post-secondary education and the basic skills of reading, writing, and computation are necessary for preparing a viable work force for economic development in a changing economy, then the remedial education function may become an important component of economic development. Increased funding for this function will help meet the economic development priority. Therefore, a review of the funding system for remedial education at the state level, and a subsequent change in funding, could alter the priority for this type of education at the local level.

**b. States which do not fund remedial education at the post-secondary level should consider adopting a funding policy.**

A few states responding to the survey reported that they did not fund remedial education in community/junior colleges. These states should assess the present and anticipated future need for funding this education mission. If remedial education is considered a mission of the community/junior colleges in a state, these institutions should receive state funding for fulfilling that mission.

The funding patterns of other states can be studied if a state makes the determination to fund remedial education. Also, the funding system for other functions of post-secondary education (e.g., transfer, vocational, adult) can be analyzed in anticipation of funding for remedial education.

5. Levels Where Remedial Education Is Conducted

**a. Each state ought to provide for remedial education at a variety of educational levels and institutional types.**

Many states reported that remedial education experiences were provided in a number of institutional types at different educational levels. Community/junior colleges were identified as enrolling the largest number of students in remedial education.

Each state should ascertain the need for remedial education and identify those institutional types which might make the greatest impact in meeting or eliminating the need.

The remedial education function should fit the institutional mission for the effective and efficient delivery of this type of education. Normally, community/junior colleges, adult education centers, vocational/technical schools, correctional institutions or school systems, and secondary schools are institutions with a mission compatible with remedial education.

Some states reported that their four-year colleges and universities were providers of remedial education. This practice should be reviewed since the national trend appears to be away from remedial education at the four-year level except for special admittance type programs. Perhaps, remedial education is not appropriate for the mission of four-year colleges and universities.

**b. States in which remedial education is conducted at a variety of educational levels and institutional types should strengthen efforts to coordinate funding and delivery systems.**

State agencies/boards responsible for education at a variety of levels where remedial education is conducted should, cooperatively, develop remedial education goals for each educational level and institutional type. Representatives from institutions at these educational levels should participate in the goal-setting activity.

Remedial education efforts among institutions and between educational levels should be coordinated to eliminate duplication of efforts and to bridge gaps in service. Funding should correspond to the coordinated efforts and reflect level and institutional goals for maximum impact.

A primary result of a coordinated effort for remedial education ought to be the articulation of basic skills programs between levels and among institutions. Once goals have been established for levels and institutions, the programs developed and implemented to reach the goals should be articulated to eliminate duplication and gaps. Articulated programs should strengthen the delivery of remedial education, insure that student needs are met at the appropriate level by the appropriate institution and work toward the reduction of the need for remediation at the post-secondary level for, at least, those students who progress regularly through the educational system from elementary through secondary to post-secondary education.

6. Status of Remedial Education

**a. Each state should continue to monitor the need for remedial education and the efforts of its community/junior colleges in meeting that need.**

It appears that, in general, the need for remedial education will continue to expand at the post-secondary level. The five-year trends reported in this study seem to indicate continued growth. However, each state is somewhat unique and the remedial education needs will no doubt vary by state.

Statewide needs analyses, studies of freshmen entering community/junior colleges, results of secondary-education-level minimal-competency tests and communications and dialogue with educational leaders at the local level will assist a state agency or board to monitor remedial education needs. A statewide remedial education advisory committee may be an effective vehicle to obtain information regarding the needs for and effects of remedial education at the post-secondary level.

Further, a statewide public education or information effort should be undertaken after an assessment is made of needs and results. The public at large should be informed of the need for and results of remedial education at the post-secondary level. There are also special groups which require additional information and education. Workshops could be conducted for trustees and staffs from the local levels to keep them informed and supportive of remedial education, if support is needed. Such workshops may also be beneficial to state staffs, including members of educational boards and agencies, the executive and legislative staffs, and staffs from other state entities interested in post-secondary education.

b. **States should encourage local community/junior colleges to determine and meet the need for remedial education at the local level.**

About one half of the respondents to this study reported that the remedial education mission was being fulfilled to a high degree at the local level. While this finding is an encouraging one, there probably are differences within each state as well as between states.

The local community/junior college can be encouraged to increase its efforts in remedial education. State agencies/boards coordinating or administering these colleges can suggest a number of activities to help their colleges improve. In some cases, they could even assist the colleges with the activities.

A partial list of activities which might assist community/junior colleges in determining and meeting remedial education needs follows:

1. Conduct community needs analyses.
2. Test entering freshmen to assess basic skills.
3. Conduct drop-out studies.
4. Articulate with feeder secondary schools.
5. Establish a local remedial education advisory committee.
6. Evaluate or review existing programs or services.
7. Strengthen the system of sorting/distributing students within the college's programs so that students can be academically prepared for the programs they enter.
8. Review admission requirements for entry into transfer and vocational programs.

With the national emphasis on a return to "basic" education at the elementary and secondary school levels, the needs for remedial education may change in the not-so-distant future. While the direction and type of changes in need will, no doubt, vary among and within the states, it will be imperative for community/junior colleges to continually reassess the needs in their local communities. The increased emphasis for accountability in basic education will probably not stop at the secondary school level. Community/junior colleges will need to regularly reassess their effectiveness in meeting remedial education needs. State agencies and boards can assume a leadership role in helping local institutions respond to these anticipated challenges.

REFERENCES

Clowes, Daniel A. "More Than a Definitional Problem: Remedial, Compensatory and Developmental Education." Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education, Fall, 1980, pp. 8-10.

Cosand, Joseph P. Perspective: Community Colleges in the 1980s. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979.

Cross, K. Patricia. Accent on Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Developmental Studies in the TEC System: An Historical Perspective on Rationale. Columbia: South Carolina State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, July 18, 1983.

Magarrell, Jack. "Colleges Offered 15 Percent More Courses This Year, Survey Finds; Remedial Classes Increase 22 Percent." The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 1, 1981, pp. 1, 8.

Maxwell, Martha. Improving Student Learning Skills: A Comprehensive Guide to Successful Practices and Programs for Increasing the Performance of Underprepared Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

P.L. 81-803, Illinois General Assembly, September 9, 1979.

Platform for Excellence: A Review and Projection of Basic Skills, Developmental and Learning Support Education. Olympia: Washington State Board for Community Colleges, April, 1983.

Promises to Keep: Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities. Sacramento: California Post-Secondary Education Commission. January, 1983.

Roueche, John E., ed. "Increasing Basic Skills by Developmental Studies." New Directions for Higher Education 20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Roueche, John E. "Let's Get Serious About the High Risk Student." Community and Junior College Journal, September, 1978, pp. 28-31.

Roueche, John E. and Snow, Jerry J. Overcoming Learning Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Study of Remedial/Developmental Education in Maryland Community Colleges. Annapolis: Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, January, 1982.

APPENDIX

Cover Letter

Mail Questionnaire

Dear State Director:

The National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges has commissioned a study of Remedial education in the States. For purposes of this study, Remedial education includes the basic skills areas of reading, writing and mathematics which are usually considered competencies learned at the secondary (high school) level. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire within seven (7) days and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope.

As part of this study, we are also requesting a copy of the following:

1. Official state-level definition of remedial education;

2. Official mission statement or legal charge for remedial education including rules and regulations, policy statement or guidelines;

3. Funding regulation or formula for remedial education.

Please send this information to:

Dr. William E. Piland
Curriculum & Instruction Department
DeGarmo 232
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

This study will give us a comprehensive view of remedial education at the state level throughout the country. The results will be reported at the Spring 1984 meeting of the NCSD which will be held during the annual AACJC convention.

Thank you for your participation in this important project. If you have any questions about the survey instrument or information requested, please call me.

Sincerely,

Dr. William E. Piland
Professor of Education
309/436-5425

WEP/blr

COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES STATE DIRECTORS
REMEDIAL EDUCATION SURVEY

I. REMEDIAL EDUCATION--DEFINITION

1. Does your state have an official or working definition of remedial education?

___ Yes (Go to #3)
___ No (Go to #2)
___ Not sure (Go to #3)

2. If no, should there be one?

___ Yes
___ No
___ Not Sure

3. Check the following educational functions if they are considered part of your definition of remedial education.

___ Adult Basic Education

___ General Education Development (Secondary Education)

___ English as a Second Language

___ High School Level Academic Courses (e.g., Mathematics, English, Reading)

___ Personal Improvement Courses (Study Skills, Personal Development, Career Awareness)

___ Other _____

_____

_____

II. REMEDIAL EDUCATION--MISSION STATEMENT

4. Is there a remedial education mission statement in your state's community/junior college enabling law, state policy, state education regulations and/or state guidelines?

___ Yes (Go to #5)
___ No (Go to #6)

5. If yes, has the mission statement changed within the past three (3) years?

___ Yes
___ No

If yes, please explain the change.

_____

_____

_____

III. REMEDIAL EDUCATION--PROVIDERS

6. Check the types of institutions which are primary providers of remedial education.

___ Community/Junior Colleges

___ Four-Year Colleges and Universities

___ Vocational/Technical Schools

___ Secondary Schools

___ Adult Education Centers

___ Other _____

_____

7. Which type of institution checked in #6 serves the largest number of students in remedial education?

_____

8. Have there been within the past 3 years, or are there anticipated, any shifts in the types of institutions where remedial education will be conducted?

___ Yes

___ No

___ Not sure

If yes, please explain.

_____

_____

_____

_____

IV. REMEDIAL EDUCATION--ADMINISTRATION/COORDINATION

9. Check the governmental agencies at the state level which have authority for administering/coordinating the remedial education mission in community/junior colleges.

___ Elementary-Secondary Board/Agency

___ Community/Junior College Board/Agency

___ Higher Education Board/Agency

___ Governor's Office

___ Vocational/Technical Board/Agency

___ Other _____

10. If the authority is shared between agencies, what are the primary responsibilities of each agency in remedial education?

Agency: _____

Responsibilities: _____

_____

_____

Agency: _____

Responsibilities: _____

_____

_____

V. REMEDIAL EDUCATION--FUNDING

11. Do community/junior college remedial courses receive state funding?

___ Yes (Go to #12)

___ No (Go to #21)

12. If yes, how does your state determine funding?

_____

_____

_____

13. On what basis is the state funding for community/junior college remedial education determined? (Check appropriate response[s]).

___ Per Course

___ Per Credit Hour

___ Per Contact Hour

___ Per Student

___ Other _____

_____

14. What rate of state funding currently exists for remedial education in community/junior colleges? (Per response to #13.)

$ _____

15. What is the average funding rate for all community/junior college education supported by the state? (Per response to #13.)

_____ State Average

_____ Liberal Arts Average

_____ Vocational Average

_____ Other _____

16. How much total money was expended by your state for remedial education in community/junior colleges during the 1982 fiscal year?

    $ _____

17. What percentage of total state funding was expended for remedial education in community/junior colleges in FY 1982?

    ___ %

18. Is the expenditure percentage indicated in Question #17 in FY 82 more or less than it was in FY 81?

    ___ More

    ___ Less

    ___ Same

19. What do you expect the future trend for state funding for remedial education to become?

    ___ Increasing over next three years

    ___ Remaining constant over next three years

    ___ Decreasing over next three years

20. How are the following generic course areas in community/junior colleges funded by your state? (Please check the appropriate category.)

| Remedial | Other | Not Funded | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ___ | ___ | ___ | Math, High School (Secondary) Level |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | English, High School (Secondary) Level |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | Reading, High School (Secondary) Level |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | Social Studies, High School (Secondary) Level |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | General Science, High School (Secondary) Level |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | Consumer Education |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | Basic Business Understanding |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | Study Skills |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | Career Awareness |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | Personal Development |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | English as a Second Language (ESL) |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | Adult Basic Education (ABE) |
| ___ | ___ | ___ | General Education Development (GED) |

21. Does your state have a requirement that students pay full share for remedial education?

___ Yes

___ No

___ Not sure

## VI. REMEDIAL EDUCATION--PRESENT STATUS

22. Compared to 5 years ago, how much emphasis is remedial education receiving at the state level today?

___ More emphasis

___ Less emphasis

___ No change in emphasis

23. Compared to 5 years ago, what is the current enrollment in remedial education?

___ Substantially more students enrolled

___ Somewhat more students enrolled

___ No change

___ Somewhat fewer students enrolled

___ Substantially fewer students enrolled

24. How important is the remedial education mission compared to other junior/community college missions at the:

| State Level | Local Level | |
|---|---|---|
| ___ | ___ | Substantially more important |
| ___ | ___ | Somewhat more important |
| ___ | ___ | Of equal importance |
| ___ | ___ | Somewhat less important |
| ___ | ___ | Substantially less important |

25. To what degree is the remedial education mission being fulfilled at the:

| State Level | Local Level | |
|---|---|---|
| ___ | ___ | To a high degree |
| ___ | ___ | Somewhat |
| ___ | ___ | To a low degree |
| ___ | ___ | Not at all |

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024
FEB 1 1985